

Immigrated urn models - asymptotic properties and applications

L.X. Zhang^a, F. Hu^{b,*}, S.H. Cheung^c, W.S. Chan^d

^a*Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310028, People's Republic of China*

^b*Department of Statistics, University of Virginia, Halsey Hall, Charlottesville, Virginia
200904-4135, USA*

^c*Department of Statistics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, HongKong, People's
Republic of China*

^d*Department of Finance, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, HongKong, People's
Republic of China*

Abstract

Urn models have been widely studied and applied in both scientific and social disciplines. In clinical studies, the adoption of urn models in treatment allocation schemes has been proved to be beneficial to both researchers, by providing more efficient clinical trials, and patients, by increasing the probability of receiving the better treatment. In this paper, we endeavor to derive a very general class of immigrated urn models that incorporates the immigration mechanism into the urn process. Important asymptotic properties are developed and illustrative examples are provided to demonstrate the applicability of our proposed class of urn models. In general, the immigrated urn model has smaller variability than the corresponding urn model. Therefore, it is more powerful when used in clinical trials.

Keywords: Adaptive designs, Asymptotic normality, Clinical trial, Urn model, Branching process with immigration, Birth and death urn, Drop-the-loser rule.

*Corresponding address: Department of Statistics, University of Virginia, Halsey Hall, Charlottesville, Virginia 200904-4135, USA. Tel: +1 434 924 3014; fax +1 434 924 3076.

E-mail addresses: stazlx@zju.edu.cn (L.X. Zhang), fh6e@virginia.edu (F. Hu), shcheung@cuhk.edu.hk (S.H. Cheung), chanws@cuhk.edu.hk (W.S. Chan)

1 Introduction

1.1. *Urn Models and their applications*

Urn models have long been considered powerful mathematical instruments in many areas, including the physical sciences, biological sciences, social sciences, and engineering (Johnson and Kotz, 1977; Kotz and Balakrishnan, 1997). For example, in medical science, Knoblauch, Neitz, and Neitz (2006) apply an urn model to study cone ratios in human and macaque retinas. In population genetics, Benaïm, Schreiber, and Tarrés (2004) make use of a class of generalized Pólya urn models to scrutinize evolutionary processes. In economics, the model is employed to capture the mechanism of reinforcement learning by Erev and Roth (1998) and Beggs (2005). In business, a coupled Pólya urn model is utilized by Windrum (2004) to examine the recent browser war between Netscape and Microsoft. In decision science, McCabe-Dansted and Slinko (2006) employ the urn model to investigate the social choice rules that are influential factors which affect the outcomes of elections. In addition, numerous examples of applications of urn models in the areas of physics, communication theory, and computer science are also provided by Milenkovic and Compton (2004).

In recent decades, the application of urn models in clinical trials has attracted great attention from biomedical researchers. Urn models have played an important role in the advancement of adaptive design methodologies that provide treatment allocation schemes which depend on the history of treatment outcomes. The principle of adaptive designs is to skew the probability of treatment allocation so that fewer patients receive inferior treatment, amid the accumulation of information on treatment effectiveness as the clinical study progresses.

In adaptive design, an early influential urn model is the generalized Pólya urn (GPU) that was discussed in Athreya and Karlin (1968), Wei and Durham (1978), and Wei (1979). The GPU is based on the Pólya urn model which was originally constructed to model contagious diseases (Eggenberger and Pólya, 1923). For example, the GPU model of Wei (1979) can be described as following: Assume that each incoming patient is assigned to one of K treatments, and the GPU is updated at each stage by adding one additional ball of the same treatment type if the treatment is successful, and by adding an additional $\frac{1}{K-1}$ ball of the other $K-1$ treatment types if the treatment is unsuccessful. By embedding the urn process in a branching process, asymptotic properties of the GPU model have been obtained in Janson (2004).

Another class of urn models with applications to clinical trials is the ternary urn model (Ivanova and Flournoy, 2001). A special case is the randomized Pólya urn (RPU) proposed by Durham, Flournoy, and Li (1998). Unlike the GPU of Wei (1979), the RPU only rewards balls to successful treatments. Another example is the birth and death urn (Ivanova et al., 2000; Ivanova and Flournoy, 2001). The ternary urn model induces diagonal generating matrices. The asymptotic properties of ternary urn model can be obtained by embedding the urn process in a branching process.

However, there are several serious drawbacks of the classical urn models: (i) it is only for binary (multinomial) responses; (ii) it has a predetermined limit that usually does not have any formal optimal properties (for example, the randomized play-the-winner rule (Wei and Durham, 1978), see Hu and Rosenberger, 2006 for details); (iii) it usually has higher variability than other procedures (Hu and Rosenberger, 2003), and therefore is less powerful.

1.2. Objectives and organization of the paper

In this paper, we develop a more general class of urn models that incorporate immigration, called the immigrated urn (IMU) model hereafter. Both the GPU model and the ternary urn model can be viewed as special cases of the IMU model. An example of the IMU model is the drop-the-loser (DL) rule proposed by Ivanova (2003). But the DL rule is limited to binary (multinomial) responses and it has a predetermined limit that does not have any formal optimal properties (Hu and Rosenberger, 2006). The IMU encompasses a much wider spectrum of urn models and incorporates the immigration process, which offers a greater flexibility in the choice of appropriate urn models in applications. The main features of the proposed IMU model are: (i) It includes other classes of urn model as special cases; (ii) It can be used to target any given allocation proportion (optimal allocations in clinical trials, see examples in Section 4); and (iii) in the class of IMU models, one can design his own IMU model that yields a smaller variability than other urn procedures.

The exploration of asymptotic properties also helps the reader to evaluate the merits of different models in this class. In the literature, asymptotic properties of urn models are usually proven by using Athreya and Ney's (1972) technique of embedding the urn process in a continuous-time branching process. This technique does not apply to the IMU due to the possible nonhomogeneous immigration process of the IMU. It is worth to point out that the asymptotic properties of the GPU model are obtained under specific conditions of the generating matrix. However, these conditions are usually not satisfied in framework of the IMU models discussed in this article.

In this paper, we represent the IMU process by an approximated Wiener process and then obtain the asymptotic properties of the IMU. The main contributions of this paper are:

- (a) to formulate a general class of urn models with the immigration process (IMU model); and
- (b) to derive important asymptotic properties, including strong consistency and asymptotic normality of treatment proportions;
- (c) to obtain some useful and desirable IMU models based on the asymptotic properties.

In Section 2, the IMU process is outlined. Asymptotic properties are examined in Section 3. Illustrative examples that are related to the applications of the IMU are given

in Section 4. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 5. Finally, the technical proofs are stated in the Appendix.

2 The immigrated urn model

Suppose subjects arrive sequentially to be randomized to one of K treatments and respond immediately. An IMU model is defined as follows. Consider an urn that contains balls of $K + 1$ types. Balls of types $1, \dots, K$ represent treatments, and balls of type 0 are the immigration balls.

Initially, there are $Z_{0,i} (> 0)$ balls of type i , $i = 0, \dots, K$. Let $\mathbf{Z}_0 = (Z_{0,0}, \dots, Z_{0,K})$ be the initial urn composition. When a patient arrives, a ball is drawn at random and the corresponding treatment will be assigned to this person. Now, right before the m -th subject arrives to be randomized to a treatment, let $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1} = (Z_{m-1,0}, \dots, Z_{m-1,K})$ denote the composition of the urn. To avoid a negative likelihood of selecting a treatment, we adopt a slight adjustment to $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}$ and let $Z_{m-1,i}^+ = \max(0, Z_{m-1,i})$, $i = 1, \dots, K$, and $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}^+ = (Z_{m-1,0}^+, \dots, Z_{m-1,K}^+)$.

To randomize the m -th subject, a ball is drawn at random without replacement. The probability of selecting a ball of type i is $Z_{m-1,i}^+ / |\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}^+|$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, K$. Here, $|\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}^+| = \sum_{j=0}^K Z_{m-1,j}^+$. Therefore, the balls with a negative value in $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}$ will have no chance of being selected.

If the drawn ball is of type 0 (i.e., an immigration ball), no subject is treated and the ball is returned to the urn. Furthermore, $A_{m-1} = a_{m-1,1} + \dots + a_{m-1,K}$ additional balls, $a_{m-1,k} (\geq 0)$ of treatment type k , $k = 1, \dots, K$ are added to the urn. If the immigration ball is selected l times before a treatment ball is drawn, the urn composition $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}$ is updated to $(Z_{m-1,0}, Z_{m-1,1} + la_{m-1,1}, \dots, Z_{m-1,K} + la_{m-1,K})$ and the $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}^+$ is updated to $(Z_{m-1,0}, (Z_{m-1,1} + la_{m-1,1})^+, \dots, (Z_{m-1,K} + la_{m-1,K})^+)$.

If a treatment ball is drawn (say, of type k , for some $k = 1, \dots, K$), the m -th subject is given treatment k and the outcome $\xi_{m,k}$ of this subject on treatment k is observed. The ball is not replaced. Instead, $D_{m,kj} = D_{kj}(\xi_{m,k})$ balls of type j will be added to the urn, $j = 1, \dots, K$. $D_{m,kj} < 0$ signifies the removal of balls.

With the IMU, the number of immigration balls remains unchanged and a treatment ball is dropped when it is drawn. The number of treatment balls that is added to the urn depends on

- (a) the value of $a_{m,k}$ when an immigration ball is drawn from the urn, and
- (b) the value of $D_{m,kj}$ when a ball of treatment type k is selected.

Here, $a_{m,k}$ s represents the immigration rates and $D_{m,kj}$ s represents the adding rules. When $a_{m,k} = 0$, we obtain the GPU models if one chooses the adding rule $D_{m,kj}$ as in Section 4.1 in Hu and Rosenberger (2006). When $a_{m,k} = 0$, one can obtain the ternary urn model by choosing the $D_{m,kj}$ as in the Section 4.4 in Hu and Rosenberger (2006).

For two-treatment case, one may choose $a_{m,k} = 1$, and suitable $D_{m,kj}$ (see Example 2) to obtain the drop-the-loser rule. In general, we can select suitable $a_{m,k}$ and $D_{m,kj}$ to obtain the desirable IMU model. Examples can be found in Section 4.

It is important to note that both $a_{m,k}$ and $D_{m,kj}$ depend on m . This allows both the immigration rates and the adding rules to depend on the responses of clinical trial. Consequently, it enables us to search for the desirable IMU model that can be used to target any given allocation proportion. Since both $a_{m,k}$ and $D_{m,kj}$ depend on m , it is impossible to use Atheya and Ney's (1972) technique of embedding the urn process in a continuous-time branching process.

After the treatment assignment of the n -th subject, $N_{n,k}$ is used to denote the number of subjects who are being assigned to treatment k , $k = 1, \dots, K$. In clinical studies, the proportion $N_{n,k}/n$, $k = 1, \dots, K$ of patients being assigned to various treatments is useful information. The distributional properties and statistical behavior of $N_{n,k}/n$ are discussed in Section 3.

3 Asymptotic Properties

3.1. Notation and assumptions

Important asymptotic properties for the immigrated urn model are derived in this section. First, we need to introduce some basic notation and the required assumptions. Let θ_k be an unknown parameter from the distribution of the response $\xi_{m,k}$, and write $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K)$. Assume that the immigration rates

$$a_{m-1,k} = a_k(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m-1}), \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (3.1)$$

where $a_k(\cdot)$ s are continuous functions, and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{m-1} = (\hat{\theta}_{m-1,1}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{m-1,K})$ and $\hat{\theta}_{m-1,k}$ are the current estimates of θ_k , $k = 1, \dots, K$. The immigration process that is defined in (3.1) has two functions. The first is to prevent the possibility of the extinction of a particular type of treatment ball. The second is to adjust the treatment allocation proportions according to the current estimates of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that the unknown parameter θ_k is the mean of the outcome $\xi_{m,k}$ and we take the sample mean as its estimate. Write $\boldsymbol{\xi}_m = (\xi_{m,1}, \dots, \xi_{m,K})$. For the adding rules, let $\mathbf{D}_m = (D_{m,kj}; k, j = 1, \dots, K)$, $\mathbf{D}_m^{(k)} = (D_{m,k1}, \dots, D_{m,kK})$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, and $\mathbf{H} = (h_{kj}) = \mathbf{E}\mathbf{D}_n$. Let $\hat{\theta}_{m-1,k}$ be the sample mean of the outcomes

$$\hat{\theta}_{m-1,k} = \frac{\alpha + S_{m-1,k}}{\beta + N_{m-1,k}}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $S_{m-1,k}$ is the sum of the outcomes on treatment k of the previous $m - 1$ subjects. Here, $\alpha, \beta > 0$ are used to avoid the nonsense case of $0/0$. In general, many estimators, for example, the MLE, can be written in the form of (3.2) with $S_{m-1,k}$ being replaced by a sum of functions of the treatment outcomes plus a negligible remainder.

Assumption 3.1 Functions $a_k(\cdot) > 0$ are continuous and twice differentiable at θ .

Assumption 3.2 $\{(\xi_{m,k}, D_{m,k1}, \dots, D_{m,kK}); m \geq 1\}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, are K sequences of i.i.d. random variables with $\sup_m E|D_{m,kj}|^{2+\delta} < \infty$, and $\sup_m E|\xi_{m,k}|^{2+\delta} < \infty$ for some $0 < \delta \leq 2$, $k = 1, \dots, K$. Further, assume that $D_{m,kk} \geq -C$ for some C , $k = 1, \dots, K$, and also, either $h_{kj} > 0$ or $D_{m,kj} \geq 0$ for $k \neq j$.

Assumption 3.3 $H\mathbf{1}' < \mathbf{1}'$, i.e., $\sum_{j=1}^K h_{kj} < 1$ for all $k = 1, \dots, K$. Here, $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)$.

Assumption 3.3 means that the average number of added balls at each step according to the outcome of a treatment is less than the number (one) of dropped balls. Thus, the urn is updated mainly by immigration. When the number of added balls exceeds one, the total number of balls in the urn will monotonically increase to infinity, and as a result, the probability of drawing an immigration ball will monotonically decrease to zero. This model is equivalent to the generalized Pólya urn model without immigration, which has been well studied (c.f., Hu and Rosenberger, 2006).

For the immigration rates, write $a_k = a_k(\theta)$. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_K)$, $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}$, $s = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}\mathbf{1}' = \sum_{k=1}^K u_k$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u}/s$. Further, denote $\Sigma_k = \text{Var}\{D_1^{(k)}\}$, $\Sigma_{11} = \sum_{k=1}^K v_k \Sigma_k$, $\Sigma_{12} = (\text{Cov}\{D_{1,kj}, \xi_k\}; j, k = 1, \dots, K)$, $\Sigma_{22} = \text{diag}(\text{Var}\{\xi_{1,1}, \dots, \text{Var}\{\xi_{1,K}\})$, and

$$\Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{11} & \Lambda_{12} \\ \Lambda'_{12} & \Lambda_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{11} & \Sigma_{12} \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \\ \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \Sigma'_{12} & \Sigma_{22} \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.3)$$

REMARK 3.1 Notice that $h_{ij} \geq 0$ for $i \neq j$. The existence of $(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}$ is implied by Assumption 3.3. Also, this assumption can be replaced by a more general assumption in which there is a vector $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, \dots, e_K)$ such that $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{e}' < \mathbf{e}'$ and $e_i > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, K$.

3.2. Main asymptotic results

Theorem 3.1 Suppose Assumptions 3.1-3.3 are satisfied. Denote $\mathbf{N}_n = (N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,K})$ and $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\theta)$. One can define a $2K$ -dimensional Wiener processes $(\mathbf{W}(t), \mathbf{B}(t))$ such that

$$\text{Var}\{(\mathbf{W}(t), \mathbf{B}(t))\} = t\Lambda \quad (3.4)$$

and

$$\mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{W}(n)\mathbf{A} + \int_0^n \frac{\mathbf{B}(x)}{x} dx \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} + o(n^{1/2-\epsilon}) \text{ a.s.} \quad (3.5)$$

for some $\epsilon > 0$, where $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{1}'\mathbf{v})$,

$$\mathbf{v}(\theta) = \frac{\mathbf{a}(\theta)(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}}{\mathbf{a}(\theta)(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}\mathbf{1}'} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\theta)}{\partial \theta} = \left(\frac{\partial v_k(\theta)}{\partial \theta_j}; j, k = 1, \dots, K \right).$$

Here, $1/\mathbf{v} = (1/v_1, \dots, 1/v_K)$.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 is given in the Appendix. Using Equation (3.5), the consistency property and asymptotic normality can be derived.

Corollary 3.1 *Under the Assumptions in Theorem 3.1,*

$$\mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \text{ a.s. and } \sqrt{n}\left(\frac{\mathbf{N}_n}{n} - \mathbf{v}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \quad (3.6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D + 2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{D\xi} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}'_{D\xi}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D &= \mathbf{A}'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11}\mathbf{A}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{D\xi} = \mathbf{A}'\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12}\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi &= \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}\right)' \text{diag}\left(\frac{\sigma_{\xi 1}^2}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\sigma_{\xi K}^2}{v_K}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if $\mathbf{D}_m \equiv \text{const}$, then

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\frac{\mathbf{N}_n}{n} - \mathbf{v}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(\mathbf{0}, 2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi);$$

if $a_{m,k} \equiv a_k$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, do not depend on the estimates, then

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\frac{\mathbf{N}_n}{n} - \mathbf{v}\right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D).$$

Proof. Notice $(\mathbf{W}(n), \int_0^n \frac{\mathbf{B}(x)}{x} dx)$ is a centered Gaussian vector with

$$\mathbf{W}(n) = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \text{ a.s.},$$

$$\int_0^n \frac{\mathbf{B}(x)}{x} dx = O(1) + \int_e^n \frac{O(\sqrt{x \log \log x})}{x} dx = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \text{ a.s.},$$

$$\text{Var}\{\mathbf{W}(n)\} = n\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11},$$

$$\text{Var}\left\{\int_0^n \frac{\mathbf{B}(x)}{x} dx\right\} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22} \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \int_0^n \int_0^n \frac{x \wedge y}{xy} dx dy = 2n \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22} \text{diag}(\mathbf{v})$$

and

$$\text{Cov}\left\{\mathbf{W}(n), \int_0^n \frac{\mathbf{B}(x)}{x} dx\right\} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \int_0^n \frac{x \wedge n}{x} dx = n \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}).$$

(3.6) follows from (3.5) immediately. $\square$

REMARK 3.2 *In practice, the outcomes in clinical trials are not available immediately prior to the treatment allocation of the next subject. The parameters can be estimated and the urn can be updated only according to the observed responses. In the delayed response case, we let $\mu_k(m, l)$ be the probability that the outcome of the m -th subject on treatment k occurs after at least another l subjects arrive. If $\mu_k(m, l) \leq Cl^{-\gamma}$ for some $\gamma \geq 2$, we can show that the total sum of unobserved outcomes up to the n -th assignment is a high order of $\sqrt{n}$ and so the conclusion in Theorem 3.1 remains true. It has been shown that the delay machine does not effect the asymptotic properties for many response-adaptive designs if the delay decays with a power rate (c.f., Bai, Hu, and Rosenberger, 2002; Hu and Zhang, 2004; Zhang et al., 2007).*

Next, we consider a special case that includes the generalized drop-the-loser rule of Zhang et al. (2007) in which $\mathbf{D}_m$ is a diagonal matrix.

Corollary 3.2 *Suppose Assumptions 3.1-3.2 are satisfied, $D_{m,kj} = 0$ for $j \neq k$, and $h_k = 1 - ED_{1,kk} > 0$. Write $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_K)$,*

$$v_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h}) = \frac{a_k(\boldsymbol{\theta})/h_k}{\sum_{j=1}^K a_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})/h_j} \quad k = 1, \dots, K,$$

$\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h}) = (v_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h}), \dots, v_K(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h}))$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} &= \left(\frac{\partial v_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \theta_j}; j, k = 1, \dots, K \right), \\ \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \mathbf{h}} &= \left(\frac{\partial v_k(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial h_j}; j, k = 1, \dots, K \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\frac{\mathbf{N}_n}{n} \rightarrow \mathbf{v} \quad a.s. \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}_n}{n} - \mathbf{v} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \quad (3.7)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D + 2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{D\xi} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}'_{D\xi}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D &= \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \mathbf{h}} \right)' \text{diag} \left(\frac{\sigma_{D1}^2}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\sigma_{DK}^2}{v_K} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \mathbf{h}}, \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\xi &= \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \right)' \text{diag} \left(\frac{\sigma_{\xi 1}^2}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\sigma_{\xi K}^2}{v_K} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{D\xi} &= - \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \mathbf{h}} \right)' \text{diag} \left(\frac{\sigma_{D\xi 1}^2}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\sigma_{D\xi K}^2}{v_K} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\sigma_{Dk}^2 = \text{Var}\{D_{1,kk}\}$, $\sigma_{\xi k}^2 = \text{Var}\{\xi_{1,k}\}$, $\sigma_{\xi Dk}^2 = \text{Cov}\{D_{1,kk}, \xi_{k,1}\}$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$.

Proof. It is easy to check that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{D1}^2 v_1, \dots, \sigma_{DK}^2 v_K)$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{\xi D1}^2, \dots, \sigma_{\xi DK}^2)$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{\xi 1}^2, \dots, \sigma_{\xi K}^2)$, $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(1/\mathbf{h})(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{1}'\mathbf{v})$, and $\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{h})/\partial \mathbf{h} = -\text{diag}(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{A}$. The results follow from Corollary 3.1. $\square$

If Assumption 3.3 is not satisfied and $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{1}' = \mathbf{1}'$, the following theorem can be used to yield the consistency property of the allocation proportion.

Theorem 3.2 *Suppose Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 are satisfied, and $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{1}' = \mathbf{1}'$. Suppose further, 1 is a single eigenvalue of $\mathbf{H}$. Then*

$$\mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s. \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v} = O_P(\sqrt{n}),$$

where $\mathbf{v}$ is the left eigenvalue vector of $\mathbf{H}$ that corresponds to the eigenvalue 1.

The asymptotic normality of $\mathbf{N}_n$ is still unknown when $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{1}' = \mathbf{1}'$. The proof of the above theorem is given in the Appendix.

Hu, Rosenberger and Zhang (2006) studied the variability of a randomization procedure that targets any given allocation proportion. They obtained a lower bound of the variability. For the IMU model in this paper, we have following results. When the variance of IMU model attains the lower bound, we can use the Crámer-Rao formula to compute the variance. In general, we have

Theorem 3.3 *If each $D_{m,kj}$ is a linear function of a random $\eta_{m,k}$, $j = 1, \dots, K$. Then, we have*

$$\Sigma_D = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{d}} \right)' \text{diag} \left(\frac{\text{Var}\{\eta_{1,1}\}}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\text{Var}\{\eta_{1,K}\}}{v_K} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{d}} \quad (3.8)$$

$$\Sigma_{D\xi} = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{d}} \right)' \text{diag} \left(\frac{\text{Cov}\{\eta_{1,1}, \xi_{1,1}\}}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\text{Cov}\{\eta_{1,K}, \xi_{1,K}\}}{v_K} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_K) = (E\eta_{1,1}, \dots, E\eta_{1,K})$. Further, if $\mathbf{a}(\cdot) = \text{const}$ and $\text{Var}\{\eta_{1,k}\}$ is the inverse of the Fisher information of d_k , then the asymptotic variance-covariance matrix of $\mathbf{N}_n/\sqrt{n}$ attains the following lower bound,

$$\left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{d}} \right)' \text{diag} \left((v_1 I_1)^{-1}, \dots, (v_K I_K)^{-1} \right) \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{d}} \right), \quad (3.10)$$

where I_k is the Fisher information function of parameter d_k .

Proof. In fact, if we write $\mathbf{D}_1^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{\alpha}_k + \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \eta_{1,k}$ and $\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\beta}_1 \\ \vdots \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_K \end{pmatrix}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{11} &= \sum_{k=1}^K v_k \text{Var}\{\eta_{1,k}\} \boldsymbol{\beta}_k' \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \\ &= (\text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{K})' \text{diag} \left(\frac{\text{Var}\{\eta_{1,1}\}}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\text{Var}\{\eta_{1,K}\}}{v_K} \right) \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{K} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\Sigma_{12} = (\text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{K})' \text{diag} \left(\frac{\text{Cov}\{\eta_{1,1}, \xi_{1,1}\}}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{\text{Cov}\{\eta_{1,K}, \xi_{1,K}\}}{v_K} \right).$$

However, $\partial \mathbf{H} / \partial d_k = \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_k) \mathbf{K}$, where $\mathbf{1}_k$ has zero elements except the k -th one which is 1. Also,

$$\frac{\partial (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}}{\partial d_k} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} \frac{\partial \mathbf{H}}{\partial d_k} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_k) \mathbf{K} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial d_k} &= \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} / \partial d_k}{\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{1}'} - \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} / \partial d_k}{(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} \mathbf{1}')^2} \mathbf{1}' \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} \\ &= \mathbf{v} \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_k) \mathbf{K} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{1}' \mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v} \text{diag}(\mathbf{1}_k) \mathbf{K} \mathbf{A}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e., $\partial \mathbf{v} / \partial \mathbf{d} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{v}) \mathbf{K} \mathbf{A}$. (3.8) and (3.9) are proved. $\square$

REMARK 3.3 In Theorem 3.3, we assume that the parameter d_k is a one-dimensional parameter that corresponds to treatment k for simplicity of notation. The results can be rewritten to a vector parameter d_k without any further assumptions.

4 Applications

In this section, we apply the general asymptotic results in Section 3 to selected IMU models for illustrative purposes.

Example 1: The birth and death urn (BDU)

Ivanova et al. (2000) proposed a birth and death urn (BDU) model to allocate treatments in clinical trials. In the BDU model, if a ball of treatment k is drawn and a subject is assigned to this treatment, the ball is not replaced when the treatment is a failure. When the treatment is a success, the ball is replaced and one additional ball of the same type is added to the urn. If an immigration ball is drawn, the ball is replaced and in addition, one ball of each treatment type is added. The BDU is a special case of the IMU with $a_{m,k} \equiv 1$, $D_{m,kj} = 0$ for $j \neq k$, and

- (a) $D_{m,kk} = 2$ if the treatment outcome of the m -th subject on treatment k is a success, and
- (b) $D_{m,kk} = 0$ if the treatment outcome of the m -th subject on treatment k is a failure.

For this example, the asymptotic variance attains the lower bound. It is easily seen that $\mathbf{H} = \text{diag}(2p_1, \dots, 2p_K)$, where p_k (q_k) is the success (failure) probability for treatment k , $k = 1, \dots, K$. By Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 3.3,

$$\frac{N_{n,k}}{n} \rightarrow v_k = \frac{1/(1-2p_k)}{\sum_{j=1}^K 1/(1-2p_j)} \text{ a.s., } \sqrt{n} \left(\frac{\mathbf{N}_n}{n} - \mathbf{v} \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma})$$

if $p_k < 1/2$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, where $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_K)$, $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)$ and

$$\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_D = \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{p}} \right)' \text{diag} \left(\frac{p_1 q_1}{v_1}, \dots, \frac{p_K q_K}{v_K} \right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}}{\partial \mathbf{p}}.$$

Example 2: Drop-the-loser (DL) rule and Modified DL (MDL) rule

The urn process of the DL rule is basically the same as that of the BDU. The major difference is that when the treatment is a success, the treatment ball is replaced without the addition of extra treatment balls. The DL rule is also a member of the IMU with $a_{m,k} \equiv 1$, $D_{m,kj} = 0$ for $j \neq k$, and

- (a) $D_{m,kk} = 1$ if the treatment outcome of the m -th subject on treatment k is a success, and

(b) $D_{m,kk} = 0$ if the treatment outcome of the m -th subject on treatment k is a failure.

A modified version of the DL rule (MDL) is given as follows. When a treatment ball is drawn, this ball is replaced only when the treatment outcome is a success. However, when an immigration ball is drawn, instead of adding an equal number of treatment balls to the urn, we add $C\hat{p}_k$ balls of type k , $k = 1, \dots, K$, where $\hat{p}_k$ is the current estimate of the successful probability p_k of treatment k , and C is a constant. With this model, more balls are immigrated to treatments with higher success rates, and subsequently, the limit proportions will be higher for better treatments. In fact, as shown below, the limit proportions are proportional to the odds p_k/q_k . For the DL rule, the limit proportions are proportional to $1/q_k$ (Ivanova, 2003).

This design can be compared to the generalized Pólya urn model that was proposed by Bai, Hu, and Shen (2002). For the latter, the asymptotic normality was obtained by Zhang, Hu, and Cheung (2006). Unlike the generalized Pólya urn models without immigration in which the asymptotic normality holds only when a very strict condition on eigenvalues of a generating matrix is satisfied (c.f., Bai and Hu, 2005; Janson, 2004; Zhang, Hu, and Cheung, 2006), the MDL rule and the IMU in general, as we will show, allow asymptotic normality under very mild conditions.

Regarding the asymptotic variance, it is easily seen that $\mathbf{a} = (p_1C, \dots, p_KC)$ and $\mathbf{H} = \text{diag}(p_1, \dots, p_K)$. The conditions in Corollary 3.2 are satisfied for all cases with $0 < p_k < 1$ and $k = 1, \dots, K$. Therefore, by Corollary 3.2, the limit proportions are

$$v_k = \frac{p_k/q_k}{\sum_{j=1}^K p_j/q_j}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

The asymptotic variance-covariance can be derived by the formulae in Corollary 3.2 in which $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (p_1, \dots, p_K)$, $\mathbf{h} = (q_1, \dots, q_K)$, and $\sigma_{Dk}^2 = \sigma_{\xi k}^2 = \sigma_{D\xi k}^2 = p_k q_k$, $k = 1, \dots, K$. For the two-treatment case,

$$\frac{N_{n,1}}{n} \rightarrow v_1 = \frac{p_1/q_1}{p_1/q_1 + p_2/q_2} \text{ a.s.} \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n}(N_{n,1}/n - v_1) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $\sigma^2 = q_1 q_2 [p_1^2(1 + q_2^2) + p_2^2(1 + q_1^2)] / (p_2 q_1 + p_1 q_2)^3$. However, the lower bound of the asymptotic variance is $q_1 q_2 (p_1^2 + p_2^2) / (p_2 q_1 + p_1 q_2)^3$.

Example 3: Optimal proportions for two treatments with dichotomous outcomes.

To compare two treatments with dichotomous outcomes, success or failure, Rosneberger et al. (2001) suggested an optimal proportion $v_1 = \sqrt{p_1} / (\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})$, where p_1 (p_2) is the successful probability of treatment 1 (2). To target this proportion, Zhang et al. (2007) proposed a generalized drop-the-loser urn, a special case of IMU with $a_{m,k} = C\sqrt{p_k}$, $k = 1, 2$, and $\mathbf{D}_m \equiv 0$. By Corollary 3.1 or Corollary 3.2, the asymptotic variance of the (normalized) sample proportion is

$$\frac{1}{2(\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})^3} \left(\frac{p_2 q_1}{\sqrt{p_1}} + \frac{p_1 q_2}{\sqrt{p_2}} \right),$$

which is twice the lower bound. Zhang et al. (2006) propose to use the GPU without immigration to target this proportion (c.f., their Example 2). The corresponding asymptotic variance is

$$\frac{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}}{(\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})^2} + \frac{3}{2(\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})^3} \left(\frac{p_2 q_1}{\sqrt{p_1}} + \frac{p_1 q_2}{\sqrt{p_2}} \right),$$

which is much larger.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have generated a general class of urn models that incorporates immigration. As illustrated in the examples, the IMU class comprises of many useful urn models. For explicatory purposes, we focus our discussion of these applications to the clinical environment, but these urn models can be applied to other areas for which the setting is deemed appropriate.

Important asymptotic properties are derived in this paper for the IMU class. With the asymptotic normality formula, the models can be evaluated in terms of the distributions of treatment allocation proportions. Under very mild conditions, the IMU models always yield relatively small asymptotic variances. In many cases, the asymptotic variance attains the lower bound. Thus, the IMU model usually has smaller variability than the corresponding urn model.

When the IMU models are applied in clinical trials, the responses may not be available immediately and the population could be heterogenous. There is no logistical difficulty incorporating delayed responses into the IMU models. One can update the urn when responses become available. A moderate delay in response (see Hu and Zhang, 2004) will not affect the asymptotic properties of the IMU. One can modify the proof in the Appendix to incorporate delayed responses. It can also be shown that the IMU model can accommodate heterogeneity under the conditions that are discussed in Bai and Hu (2005).

In this article, we have focused on the asymptotic properties of the IMU itself. It is important to assess the validity of the statistical inferences after using the IMU models. By applying the results of Hu, Rosenberger, and Zhang (2006), Theorem 3.1 and Corollary 3.1 ensure that the estimators have the same asymptotic properties as they would if a fixed design were used for the same allocation proportion. This provides a solid foundation for both the IMU model and its related statistical inferences. The applications of IMU models have been discussed mainly in the clinical context, but the IMU could play an important role in other areas because of its desirable properties. Clearly, the application of the IMU in other areas requires further research effort.

Appendix. Proofs

We prove Theorem 3.1 first. Recall that $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1} = (Z_{m-1,0}, Z_{m-1,1}, \dots, Z_{m-1,K})$ are the numbers of balls when the m -th subject arrives to be randomized, $\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}^+ = (Z_{m-1,0}^+, Z_{m-1,1}^+, \dots, Z_{m-1,K}^+)$ are the non-negative numbers, and $|\mathbf{Z}_{m-1}^+| = Z_{m-1,0}^+ + Z_{m-1,1}^+ + \dots + Z_{m-1,K}^+$. Write $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{m-1} = (Z_{m-1,1}, \dots, Z_{m-1,K})$. Because every immigration ball is replaced, $Z_{m-1,0}^+ = Z_{m-1,0} = Z_{0,0}$ for all m . Let $\mathbf{X}_m$ be the result of the m -th assignment, where $X_{m,k} = 1$ if the m -th subject is assigned to treatment k and 0 otherwise, $k = 1, \dots, K$. Then, $\mathbf{N}_n = (N_{n,1}, \dots, N_{n,K}) = \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{X}_m$. Further, we denote $\mathbf{a}_m = (a_{m,1}, \dots, a_{m,K})$, and u_m to be the number of draws of type 0 balls between the $(m-1)$ -th assignment and the m -th assignment.

Notice that between the $(m-1)$ -th assignment and the m -th assignment, we have drawn u_m balls of type 0. Accordingly, we have added $a_{m-1,k}u_m$ balls of type k to the urn. However, when a ball of type k is drawn, this ball is not replaced and another $D_{m,kj}$ balls of type j are added to the urn. So, the change in the number of balls after the m -th assignment is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_m - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{m-1} = \mathbf{a}_{m-1}u_m + \mathbf{X}_m(\mathbf{D}_m - \mathbf{I}). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_0 &= \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{a}_{m-1}u_m + \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{X}_m(\mathbf{D}_m - \mathbf{I}) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{a}_{m-1}u_m - \mathbf{N}_n(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) + \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{X}_m(\mathbf{D}_m - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{D}_m]) \\ &= \mathbf{a}N_{n,0} + \sum_{m=1}^n (\mathbf{a}_{m-1} - \mathbf{a})u_m - \mathbf{N}_n(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) + \mathbf{M}_n, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $N_{n,0} = \sum_{m=1}^n u_m$ is total number of draws of type 0 balls after the n -th assignment, and $\mathbf{M}_n = \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{X}_m(\mathbf{D}_m - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{D}_m])$ is a martingale.

To prove Theorem 3.1 we need two lemmas the proofs of which are stated later.

Lemma A.1 *Suppose Assumptions 3.1-3.3 are satisfied. Then,*

$$Z_{n,k} = o(n^{1/2-\delta_0}) \quad a.s., \quad k = 1, \dots, K \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for $0 < \delta_0 < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2+\delta}$.

Lemma A.2 *Suppose Assumptions 3.1-3.3 are satisfied. Then,*

$$N_{n,0} = n/s + O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s., \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$N_{n,k} = nv_k + O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s., \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where $s = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}\mathbf{1}'$. Also, for each $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,k} \rightarrow \theta_k \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,k} - \theta_k = \frac{Q_{n,k}}{nv_k} + o(n^{-1/2-\delta_0}) \quad a.s., \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where $Q_{n,k} = \sum_{m=1}^n X_{m,k}(\xi_{m,k} - E\xi_{m,k})$ is a martingale and $\mathbf{Q}_n = (Q_{n,1}, \dots, Q_{n,K})$.

Now we begin the proof of Theorem 3.1. Consider the $2K$ -dimensional martingale $\{(\mathbf{M}_n, \mathbf{Q}_n), \mathcal{A}_n; n \geq 1\}$, where $\mathcal{A}_n = \sigma(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n, \boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{n+1})$. According to (A.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n E[(\Delta \mathbf{M}_i)' \Delta \mathbf{M}_i | \mathcal{A}_{i-1}] &= \sum_{k=1}^K N_{n,k} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k \\ &= n \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{11} + O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s., \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n E[(\Delta \mathbf{Q}_i)' \Delta \mathbf{Q}_i | \mathcal{A}_{i-1}] &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{22} \text{diag}(\mathbf{N}_n) \\ &= n \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{22} + O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s., \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n E[(\Delta \mathbf{M}_i)' \Delta \mathbf{Q}_i | \mathcal{A}_{i-1}] &= \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{12} \text{diag}(\mathbf{N}_n) \\ &= n \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{12} + O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

By Corollary 1.1 of Zhang (2004), we can define the $2K$ -two-dimensional Wiener processes $(\mathbf{W}(t), \mathbf{B}(t))$ with variance-covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ such that for some $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbf{M}_n = \mathbf{W}(n) + o(n^{1/2-\epsilon}) \quad a.s., \quad \mathbf{Q}_n = \mathbf{B}(n) + o(n^{1/2-\epsilon}) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $\epsilon \leq \delta_0$, where δ_0 is defined as it is in Lemma A.1. Next, we need to show that $(\mathbf{W}(t), \mathbf{B}(t))$ satisfies (3.5). Combining (A.2) and (A.3) yields

$$\mathbf{N}_n(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) - \mathbf{a}N_{n,0} = \mathbf{M}_n + \sum_{m=1}^n (\mathbf{a}_m - \mathbf{a})u_m + o(n^{1/2-\delta_0}) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Recall $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{1}'\mathbf{v})$, $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}/(\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1}\mathbf{1}')$ and notice $\mathbf{N}_n\mathbf{1}' = n$. According to (A.12),

$$\mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{M}_n + \sum_{m=1}^n (\mathbf{a}_{m-1} - \mathbf{a})u_m)\mathbf{A} + o(n^{1/2-\delta_0}) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

For $\mathbf{a}_m - \mathbf{a}$, due to (A.7) and (A.11),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_m - \mathbf{a} &= (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + O(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2) \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{Q}_m}{m} \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + o(m^{-1/2-\delta_0}) \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{B}(m)}{m} \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + o(m^{-1/2-\epsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

Note that immigration happens only when a type 0 ball is drawn. Let τ_m be the total number of draws when the m -th type 0 ball is drawn. At this time, $\tau_m - m$ subjects are assigned and the $(\tau_m - m + 1)$ -th subject arrives to be randomized. So, we add $a_{(\tau_m - m + 1) - 1, k}$ balls of type k to the urn, $k = 1, \dots, K$. It follows that

$$\sum_{j=1}^n a_{j-1, k} \cdot u_j = \sum_{m=1}^{N_{n,0}} a_{\tau_m - m, k},$$

$$i.e., \quad \sum_{m=1}^n (\mathbf{a}_{m-1} - \mathbf{a}) u_m = \sum_{m=1}^{N_{n,0}} (\mathbf{a}_{\tau_m - m} - \mathbf{a}).$$

It is easily seen that $\tau_m = \min\{n : N_{n,0} \geq m\} + m$. Due to (A.4),

$$\tau_m - m = \min\{n : N_{n,0} \geq m\} = sm + O(\sqrt{m \log \log m}) \quad a.s.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{a}_{\tau_m - m} - \mathbf{a} &= \frac{\mathbf{B}(\tau_m - m)}{\tau_m - m} \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + o(m^{-1/2-\epsilon}) \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{B}(sm)}{sm} \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + o(m^{-1/2-\epsilon}) \quad a.s. \end{aligned}$$

Noticing (A.4), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=1}^n (\mathbf{a}_{m-1} - \mathbf{a}) u_m &= \sum_{m=1}^{N_{n,0}} \left(\frac{\mathbf{B}(sm)}{sm} \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + o(m^{-1/2-\epsilon}) \right) \\ &= \int_0^{n/s} \frac{\mathbf{B}(sx)}{sx} dx \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + o(n^{1/2-\epsilon}) \\ &= \int_0^n \frac{\mathbf{B}(x)}{x} dx \text{diag}\left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}}\right) \frac{1}{s} \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} + o(n^{1/2-\epsilon}) \quad a.s. \end{aligned} \tag{A.15}$$

However, it is easily checked that

$$\frac{1}{s} \frac{\partial \mathbf{a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} \mathbf{A} = \frac{\partial \mathbf{v}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}}. \tag{A.16}$$

Combining (A.11)-(A.16) finishes the proof of (3.5). $\square$

Now, we begin the proofs of Lemmas A.1 and A.2. We need three more lemmas.

Lemma A.3 *Under Assumption 3.2, we have*

$$Z_{n,k}^- = O(1) \quad a.s., \quad k = 1, \dots, K.$$

Proof. Notice that the balls with a negative number have no chance to be drawn. If we let $S_n = \max\{1 \leq j \leq n : Z_{j,k} > 0\}$, then according to (A.1),

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{n,k} &\geq Z_{n-1,k} + \sum_{j \neq k} X_{n,j} D_{n,kj} \geq \dots \\ &\geq Z_{S_n,k} + X_{S_n+1,k} (D_{S_n+1,kk} - 1) + \sum_{j \neq k} \sum_{m=S_n+1}^n X_{m,j} D_{m,kj} \\ &\geq -C - 1 + \sum_{j \neq k} \sum_{m=S_n+1}^n X_{m,j} D_{m,kj}. \end{aligned}$$

If $D_{m,kj} \geq 0$, then $\sum_{m=S_n+1}^n X_{m,j} D_{m,kj} \geq 0$. When $h_{kj} > 0$, it is easily seen that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=S_n+1}^n X_{m,j} D_{m,kj} &= \sum_{m=S_n+1}^n X_{m,j} (D_{m,kj} - \mathbb{E} D_{m,kj}) + \sum_{m=S_n+1}^n X_{m,j} h_{ij} \\ &\rightarrow +\infty \quad a.s. \end{aligned}$$

on $\{\sum_{m=S_n+1}^n X_{m,j} \rightarrow \infty\}$. The lemma is now proved. $\square$

Lemma A.4 Let $\mathcal{F}_n = \sigma(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n, \mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n)$ be the history sigma field, and recall $A_m = \sum_{k=1}^K a_{m,k}$. Suppose Assumption 3.2 is satisfied. Then, $\underline{A} := \min_m A_m > 0$ implies

$$E[u_n^p | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \leq c_p \left(\left(\sum_{k=1}^K Z_{n-1,k} \right)^- / \underline{A} \right)^{p+1} \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} \quad a.s., \quad \forall p \geq 1, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where $c_p > 0$ is a random variable that is a function of $Z_{0,0}$ and $\min_m A_m$. Particularly,

$$\min_m A_m > 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad E[u_n^p | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] = O(1) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Proof. Write $\underline{A} = \min_m A_m$. The event $\{u_n = l\}$ means that when the n -th subject is assigned, we have drawn $l+1$ balls continuously in which the first l balls is of type 0 and the last one is not. So, for $l = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$P(u_n = l | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) = \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} \prod_{j=1}^{l-1} \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|(\mathbf{Z}_{n-1} + j\mathbf{a}_{n-1})^+|} \left(1 - \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|(\mathbf{Z}_{n-1} + \mathbf{a}_{n-1})^+|} \right).$$

Obviously, $P(u_n = l | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) \leq Z_{0,0} / |\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|$, $l \geq 1$. Notice

$$|(\mathbf{Z}_{n-1} + j\mathbf{a}_{n-1})^+| = Z_{0,0} + \sum_{k=1}^K (Z_{n-1,k} + ja_{n-1,k})^+ \geq Z_{0,0} + \sum_{k=1}^K Z_{n-1,k} + jA_{n-1}.$$

It follows that $\underline{A} > 0$ and $\sum_{k=1}^K Z_{n-1,k} \geq -L\underline{A}$ imply

$$P(u_n = l | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}) \leq \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} \prod_{j=L}^{l-1} \frac{Z_{0,0}}{Z_{0,0} + (j-L)\underline{A}} \leq c_0 \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} e^{-2(l-L)}, \quad l \geq L, \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where $c_0 > 0$ depends only on $\underline{A}$ and $Z_{0,0}$. So

$$\mathbb{E}[u_n^p | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \leq \sum_{l=1}^L l^p \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} + \sum_{l=L+1}^{\infty} l^p c_0 \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} e^{-2(l-L)} \leq c_p L^{p+1} \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|}.$$

Taking $L = \lceil (\sum_{k=1}^K Z_{n-1,k})^- / \underline{A} \rceil + 1$ completes the proof of (A.17). (A.18) follows from (A.17) and Lemma A.3. $\square$

Lemma A.5 *Suppose Assumptions 3.1-3.2 are satisfied. Then*

$$\min_{m,k} a_{m,k} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{m,k} a_{m,k} < \infty \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Proof. It suffices to show that

$$N_{n,k} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{implies} \quad \hat{\theta}_{n,k} \rightarrow \theta_k \quad a.s., \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

In fact, if (A.21) is true, then $a_k(\mathbf{y}) > 0$ for any $\mathbf{y}$ on

$$\text{cl}\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m; m = 1, 2, \dots\} = \bigotimes_{k=1}^K \{\theta_k, \hat{\theta}_{m,k}; m = 1, 2, \dots\}.$$

By the continuity of $a_k(\cdot)$, $0 < \min_{m,k} a_k(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) \leq a_{m,k} \leq \max_{m,k} a_k(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_m) < \infty \quad a.s.$ (A.20) is satisfied. Now, notice $\{Q_{n,k}, \mathcal{A}_n\}$ is a martingale with

$$\sum_{m=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\Delta Q_{m,k})^2 | \mathcal{A}_{m-1}] = N_{n,k} \text{Var}\{\xi_{1,k}\} \leq C N_{n,k}.$$

By Theorem 3.3.10 of Stout (1974) (where $f(x) = x$),

$$N_{n,k} \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{implies} \quad \frac{Q_{n,k}}{N_{n,k}} \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

By noticing $\hat{\theta}_{n,k} = (\alpha + N_{n,k}\theta_k + Q_{n,k}) / (N_{n,k} + \beta)$, (A.21) is proved. $\square$

Proof of Lemma A.1. By Lemma A.5,

$$\underline{A} =: \min_m A_m > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{A} =: \max_m A_m < \infty \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Notice $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n \mathbf{1}' = \sum_{k=1}^K Z_{n-1,k}$. By (A.17) and Lemma A.3, $\mathbb{E}[u_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \leq C_0 Z_{0,0} / |\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|$. So, according to (A.1) or (A.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n \mathbf{1}' &= \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + u_n A_{n-1} - \mathbf{X}_n (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) \mathbf{1}' + \Delta \mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{1}' \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + A_{n-1} \mathbb{E}[u_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] - \underline{h} + A_{n-1} (u_n - \mathbb{E}[u_n | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}]) + \Delta \mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{1}' \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + C_0 \overline{A} \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} - \underline{h} + \Delta U_n \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + \Delta U_n - \underline{h} / 2, \quad \text{if } \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' \geq 2C_0 \overline{A} Z_{0,0} / \underline{h}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where $\underline{h} = \min_k(1 - \sum_{j=1}^K h_{kj}) > 0$. Here, $U_n = \sum_{m=1}^n A_{m-1}(u_m - \mathbb{E}[u_m | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}]) + \mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{1}'$ is a real martingale. Let $S_n = \max\{1 \leq j \leq n : \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_j \mathbf{1}' < 2C_0 \bar{A} Z_{0,0} / \underline{h}\}$, where $\max(\emptyset) = 0$. Then, according to (A.24),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n \mathbf{1}' &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + \Delta U_n - \underline{h}/2 \leq \dots \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{S_n} \mathbf{1}' + \Delta U_{S_n+1} + \dots + \Delta U_n - (n - S_n) \underline{h}/2 \\ &\leq |\mathbf{Z}_0| \vee (2C_0 \bar{A} Z_{0,0} / \underline{h}) + U_n - U_{S_n} - (n - S_n) \underline{h}/2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

For the martingale $\{U_n, \mathcal{F}_n; n = 1, 2, \dots\}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(\Delta U_n)^2 | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \leq C + C \max_j A_j^2 = O(1),$$

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Delta U_n|^{2+\delta} | \mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \leq C + C \max_j A_j^{2+\delta} = O(1)$$

due to Assumption 3.2 and (A.18). Accordingly, we can show that

$$U_n = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

and

$$\max_{m \leq \sqrt{n \log n}} |U_{n - [\sqrt{n \log n}] + m} - U_{n - [\sqrt{n \log n}]}| = o(n^{\frac{1}{2+\delta}} \log n) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.27})$$

If $n - S_n \geq \sqrt{n \log n}$, then for n large enough

$$U_n - U_{S_n} - (n - S_n) \underline{h}/2 \leq O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) - \underline{h} \sqrt{n \log n}/2 < 0$$

due to (A.26). Notice $n \geq S_n$. If $n - S_n < \sqrt{n \log n}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} U_n - U_{S_n} - (n - S_n) \underline{h}/2 &\leq 2 \max_{m \leq \sqrt{n \log n}} |U_{n - [\sqrt{n \log n}] + m} - U_{n - [\sqrt{n \log n}]}| \\ &= o(n^{\frac{1}{2+\delta}} \log n) \quad a.s. \end{aligned}$$

by (A.27). It follows that $\sum_{k=1}^K Z_{n,k} \leq o(n^{1/2-\delta_0})$ a.s. due to (A.25). However, $Z_{n,k}^- = O(1)$ a.s. by Lemma A.3. (A.3) is proved. $\square$

Proof of Lemma A.2. Recall $Q_{n,k} = \sum_{m=1}^n X_{m,k}(\xi_{m,k} - \theta_k)$ $k = 1, \dots, K$, and both $\{M_{n,k}, \mathcal{A}_n; n \geq 1\}$ and $\{Q_{n,k}, \mathcal{A}_n; n \geq 1\}$ are martingales. According to the law of the iterated logarithm for martingales, we have

$$M_{n,k} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{n,k} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.28})$$

However, for each $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,k} - \theta_k = \frac{Q_{n,k} + O(1)}{N_{n,k} + \beta} \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.29})$$

(A.12) remains true by Lemmas A.1. By (A.12) and (A.28) we have

$$\mathbf{N}_n(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) = \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{a}_{m-1} u_m + o(n) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Notice $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{1}' < \mathbf{1}'$. It follows that

$$n = \mathbf{N}_n \mathbf{1}' \leq \sum_{m=1}^n A_{m-1} u_m / \underline{h} + o(n) \leq (K\bar{a}/\underline{h}) N_{n,0} + o(n), \quad a.s.$$

where $\underline{h} = \min_k (1 - \sum_{j=1}^K h_{kj}) > 0$. That is,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{n,0}}{n} \geq \frac{\underline{h}}{K\bar{a}} > 0 \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.31})$$

Notice $h_{kj} \geq 0$, $k \neq j$. Then, by (A.30) and (A.31),

$$(1 - h_{kk}) \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{n,k}}{n} \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n a_{m,k} X_{m,0} \geq \underline{a} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N_{n,0}}{n} > 0 \quad a.s..$$

So, $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} N_{n,k}/n > 0$ a.s., which, together with (A.29) and (A.28), implies

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,k} - \theta_k = O\left(\frac{Q_{m,k} + O(1)}{n}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log n}{n}}\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s.$$

(A.6) is proved and also

$$a_{m,k} - a_k = a_k(\hat{\theta}_m) - a_k(\theta) = O(\|\hat{\theta}_m - \theta\|) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log m}{m}}\right) \quad a.s. \quad (\text{A.32})$$

Notice that $\sum_{m=1}^n (a_{m-1,k} - a_k)(u_m - \mathbb{E}[u_m | \mathcal{F}_{m-1}])$ is a martingale and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{(a_{m-1,k} - a_k)(u_m - \mathbb{E}[u_m | \mathcal{F}_{m-1}])}{\sqrt{m}} \right)^2 \middle| \mathcal{F}_{m-1} \right] \\ & \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(a_{m-1,k} - a_k)^2}{m} \mathbb{E}[u_m^2 | \mathcal{F}_{m-1}] \leq C \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log \log m}{m^2} < \infty \quad a.s. \end{aligned}$$

due to (A.18) and (A.32). By the law of large numbers, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=1}^n (a_{m-1,k} - a_k) u_m = \sum_{m=1}^n (a_{m-1,k} - a_k) \mathbb{E}[u_m | \mathcal{F}_{m-1}] + o(\sqrt{n}) \\ & = \sum_{m=1}^n O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log \log m}{m}}\right) O(1) + o(\sqrt{n}) = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.33})$$

by (A.18) and (A.32) again. Combining (A.12), (A.28), and (A.33) yields

$$\mathbf{N}_n - N_{n,0} \mathbf{a}(\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H})^{-1} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \quad a.s.,$$

which, together with $\mathbf{N}_n \mathbf{1}' = n$, implies (A.4) and (A.5). Then combining (A.5), (A.28), and (A.29) yields

$$\hat{\theta}_{n,k} - \theta_k = \frac{Q_{n,k} + O(1)}{nv_k + O(\sqrt{n \log \log n})} = \frac{Q_{n,k}}{nv_k} + o(n^{1/2-\delta_0}) \text{ a.s.}$$

(A.7) is proved, and the proof of Theorem 3.1 is completed. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Suppose Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 are satisfied. Notice $\mathbf{H} \mathbf{1}' = \mathbf{1}'$. Similar to (A.24),

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n \mathbf{1}' &= \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + u_n A_{n-1} + \Delta \mathbf{M}_n \mathbf{1}' \leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + C_0 \bar{A} \frac{Z_{0,0}}{|\mathbf{Z}_{n-1}^+|} + \Delta U_n \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' + C_0 \bar{A} / \sqrt{n} + \Delta U_n, \text{ if } \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{n-1} \mathbf{1}' \geq Z_{0,0} \sqrt{n}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n \mathbf{1}' &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{S_n} \mathbf{1}' + \Delta U_{S_n+1} + \dots + \Delta U_n + C_0 \bar{A} (n - S_n) / \sqrt{n} \\ &\leq 2C_0 \bar{A} \sqrt{n} + U_n - U_{S_n} \leq 2C_0 \bar{A} \sqrt{n} + 2 \max_{m \leq n} |U_m|, \end{aligned}$$

where $S_n = \max\{1 \leq j \leq n : \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_j \mathbf{1}' < Z_{0,0} / \sqrt{n}\}$ and $\max(\emptyset) = 0$. Hence,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \text{ a.s. and } = O_P(\sqrt{n}),$$

by the properties of a martingale. So, by (A.2) and the law of the iterated logarithm of martingales, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{N}_n (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) &= \mathbf{M}_n + \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{a}_{m-1} u_m - \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_n + \tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_0 \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{a}_{m-1} u_m + O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \text{ a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying $\mathbf{1}'$ yields $\sum_{m=1}^n u_m A_{m-1} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n})$ a.s., and then $N_{n,0} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n})$ a.s. and $\sum_{m=1}^n \mathbf{a}_{m-1} u_m = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n})$ a.s. by (A.20). So,

$$(\mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v})(\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{1}'\mathbf{v})) = \mathbf{N}_n (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}) = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n}) \text{ a.s.}$$

It follows that $\mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v} = O(\sqrt{n \log \log n})$ a.s. because $(\mathbf{I} - (\mathbf{H} - \mathbf{1}'\mathbf{v}))$ is reversible. The proof of $\mathbf{N}_n - n\mathbf{v} = O_P(\sqrt{n})$ is similar. $\square$

Acknowledgments

The first author's research was supported by a grant from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (10771192). The second author's research was supported by grant DMS-0349048 from the National Science Foundation (USA)

References

- [1] ATHREYA, K. B. and KARLIN, S. (1968). Embedding of urn schemes into continuous time branching processes and related limit theorems. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **39** 1801–1817.
- [2] ATHREYA, K. B. and NEY, P. E. (1972). *Branching Processes*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- [3] BAI, Z. D. and HU, F. (2005). Strong consistency and asymptotic normality for urn models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **15** 914–940.
- [4] BAI, Z. D., HU, F. and SHEN, L. (2002). An adaptive design for multi-arm clinical trials. *J. Multi. Anal.* **81** 1–18.
- [5] BAI, Z. D., HU, F. and ROSENBERGER, W. F. (2002). Asymptotic properties of adaptive designs for clinical trials with delayed response. *The Annals of Statistics* **30** 122–139.
- [6] BEGGS, A. W. (2005). On the convergence of reinforcement learning. *Journal of Economic Theory* **122** 1–36.
- [7] BENAÏM M., SCHREIBER S. J. and TARRÉS, P. (2004). Generalized urn models of evolutionary processes. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **14** 1455–1478.
- [8] DURHAM, S. D., FLOURNOY, N. and LI, W. (1998). Sequential designs for maximizing the probability of a favorable response. *Canadian Journal of Statistics* **3** 479–495.
- [9] EGGENBERGER, F. and PÓLYA, G. (1923). Über die statistik verketteter vorgänge. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Mathematik und Mechanik* **1** 279–289.
- [10] EREV, I. and ROTH, A (1998). Predicting how people play games: reinforcement learning in experimental games with unique, mixed strategy equilibria. *Amer. Econ. Rev.* **88** 848–881.
- [11] HU, F. and ROSENBERGER, W. F. (2006). *The Theory of Response-Adaptive Randomization in Clinical Trials*. John Wiley and Sons. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics.
- [12] HU, F. and ROSENBERGER, W. F. (2003). Optimality, variability, power: evaluating response-adaptive randomization procedures for treatment comparisons. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **98** 671–678.
- [13] HU, F., ROSENBERGER, W. F. and ZHANG, L.-X. (2006). Asymptotically best response-adaptive randomization procedures. *J. Statist. Plann. Inf.* **136** 1911–1922.
- [14] HU, F. and ZHANG, L.-X. (2004). Asymptotic normality of urn models for clinical trials with delayed response. *Bernoulli* **10** 447–463.
- [15] IVANOVA, A. (2003). A play-the-winner type urn model with reduced variability. *Metrika* **58** 1–13.
- [16] IVANOVA, A. and FLOURNOY, N. (2001). A birth and death urn for ternary outcomes: stochastic processes applied to urn models. In *Probability and Statistical Models with Applications* (Charalambides, Ch. A., Koutras, M. V. and Balakrishnan, N., Eds.). Chapman & Hall/CRC, 583–600.
- [17] IVANOVA, A., ROSENBERGER, W. F., DURHAM, S. D. and FLOURNOY, N. (2000). A birth and death urn for randomized clinical trials: asymptotic methods. *Sankhya B* **62** 104–118.
- [18] JANSON, S. (2004). Functional limit theorems for multitype branching processes and generalized Pólya urns. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **110** 177–245.
- [19] JOHNSON, N. L. and KOTZ, S. (1977). *Urn Models and Their Applications*. Wiley, New York.

- [20] KOTZ, S. and BALAKRISHNAN, N. (1997). Advances in urn models during the past two decades, In *Advances in Combinatorial Methods and Applications to Probability and Statistics* (Balakrishnan, N., Ed.) Birkhäuser, Boston.
- [21] KNOBLAUCH, K., NEITZ, M. and NEITZ, J. (2006). An urn model of the development of L/M cone ratios in human and macaque retinas. *Visual Neuroscience* **23** 387–394.
- [22] MCCABE-DANSTED, J. C. and SLINKO, A. (2006). Exploratory analysis of similarities between social choice rules. *Group Decision and Negotiation* **15** 77–107.
- [23] MILENKOVIC, O. and COMPTON, K. J. (2004). Probabilistic transforms for combinatorial urn models. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing* **13** 645–675.
- [24] ROSENBERGER, W. F., STALLARD, N., IVANOVA, A., HARPER, C. N. and RICKS, M. L. (2001). Optimal adaptive designs for binary response trials. *Biometrics* **57** 909–913.
- [25] STOUT, W. F. (1974). *Almost sure convergence*. Academic Press, New York.
- [26] WEI, L. J. (1979). The generalized Polya’s urn design for sequential medical trials. *Ann. Statist.* **7** 291–296.
- [27] WEI, L. J. and DURHAM, S. D. (1978). The randomized play-the-winner rule in medical trials. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **73**, 840–843.
- [28] WINDRUM, P. (2004). Leveraging technological externalities in complex technologies: Microsoft’s exploitation of standards, in the browser wars. *Research Policy* **33** 385–394.
- [29] ZHANG, L.-X. (2004). Strong approximations of martingale vectors and their applications in Markov-chain adaptive designs. *Acta Math. Appl. Sinica, English Series* **20**(2) 337–352.
- [30] ZHANG, L.-X., CHAN, W. S., CHEUNG, S. H. and HU, F. (2007). A generalized urn model for clinical trials with delayed responses. *Statistica Sinica* **17** 387–409..
- [31] ZHANG, L.-X., HU, F. and CHEUNG, S. H. (2006). Asymptotic theorems of sequential estimation-adjusted urn models. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **16** 340–369.